

**Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Commission Meeting
March 20, 2012, Room 317 City Hall**

Date of Z&P Meeting: April 19, 2012

ITEM SUMMARY

Description: Item #4, BZH #27213

Owen Metz with Dominium, on behalf of Minneapolis Leased Housing Associates IV Limited Partnership, submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness application for the treatment of the rail corridor, site plan, and the construction of a new parking structure at the Pillsbury A-Mill Complex located at 300 2nd Street SE, 400 2nd Street SE, and 100 3rd Avenue SE in the St. Anthony Falls Historic District.

Action: The Heritage Preservation Commission adopted staff findings and **approved** the Certificate of Appropriateness for the Site Plan, Parking Structure and Treatment of the Great Northern Rail Spur Corridor within the Pillsbury A Mill Complex located at 300 2nd Street SE, 400 Second Street SE and 100 3rd Avenue SE with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall submit a coordinated site plan that presents a consistent treatment of the Mid-Block and Main Street SE Rail Spur Corridors and street connections for the entire Pillsbury A Mill Complex. The coordinated site plan shall include addressing lighting, public access, hydrological resources, resource interpretation, and maintenance. The phasing and implementation plan to indicate roles and responsibilities for the coordinated plan and implementation and maintenance of those features. The coordinated and consistent site plan requires review and approval by the HPC in a public hearing prior to any building permit issuance.
2. The Applicant shall submit a Phase I Archaeological Assessment to CPED for review. The plan should also include a process for sensitively excavating archaeology in the site of the Sunken Garden or other areas identified with archaeological potential.
3. The Applicant shall submit and be responsible for implementing a plan to monitor and maintain the stability of the White Concrete Grain Elevators, the Machine Shop, Red Tile Elevator, Pillsbury A Mill, Cleaning House and the South Mill during the demolition and construction phase of the project. The plan shall be submitted to CPED for review and approval.
4. The Applicant shall submit a plan identifying the proposed process and techniques for how the rail lines within the rail spur corridors will be sensitively removed, stored and reused within the proposed project. The plan shall be submitted to CPED for review and approval.
5. The proposed street trees shall not be located in front of any of the historic entrances or loading bays of the Machine Shop, vines on White Grain elevators are not approved.
6. The proposed design for the Warehouse II Courtyard is not approved.
7. The east, Second Street SE, facing facade of the proposed Stair C to the parking structure shall comply with the window requirements of Chapter 530 of the Zoning Ordinance by providing windows on this facade.
8. The Applicant shall submit a master sign plan that addresses alterations to historic signage as well as any new proposed signs for review by the HPC in a public hearing. The proposed alterations to the Pillsbury A Mill sign or any historic building signage as well as any new signage is not approved at this time.
9. All workmanship must be completed in conformance with the Secretary of Interior Standards, see: <http://www.nps.gov/history/hps/tps/standguide/>.
10. The Applicant shall obtain all other necessary City and other agency approvals prior to the commencement of work.

11. CPED-Planning Staff shall review and approve the final plans prior to building permit issuance.
12. Approvals for this Certificate of Appropriateness shall expire if they are not acted upon within one year of approval, unless extended by the Planning Director in writing prior to one-year anniversary date of approvals;
13. By ordinance, all approvals granted in this Certificate of Appropriateness shall remain in effect as long as all of the conditions and guarantees of such approvals are observed. Failure to comply with such conditions and guarantees shall constitute a violation of this Certificate of Appropriateness and may result in termination of the approval.
14. A preservation plan shall be submitted for the White Grain elevators and the Machine Shop. This plan is to be reviewed by HPC at a public hearing.

PARTIAL TRANSCRIPTION

Public Hearing Testimony and Commission Deliberation

Kelley: Hi ... there was a Phase I archaeological report from our old colleague Christina Harrison and I guess it must be for the other half of the site, but could you, on the combined map, just kind of point out which things have been surveyed there and which haven't?

Staff Schaffer: Yes, why don't we use this image, it will work for now. The area in the hatch marks is the area proposed by Doran. This is the Mill and Main Phase 2 site. The applicant, Doran, well the property owner, Doran, has done and contracted a report that you saw for both the demolitions of the Manildra building and the Research Annex buildings. This is a Phase 1 archaeology assessment done by Christina Harrison, Archaeology Resources Group, her business name. Anyway, that proposal only included what you see as the Doran property. It did not include anything on the Dominion portions. You will see a property line here that extends ... that area is, has been reviewed for archaeology, the rest of the site has not. And her report, which we will get to in another item, identifies some areas that she was not able to do test borings on because of the depth of the soil and we can talk about that. You approved part of that with the Research Annex and that will come back as the demolition of the Manildra building.

Chair Larsen: Commissioner Tableporter?

Tableporter: Yes, Mr. Schaffer, could you back up a little bit? I'm a new commissioner so I haven't seen this before. Could you back up and discuss some of the options that we've previously seen in regards to parking?

Staff Schaffer: Yes, Commissioner Tableporter, what you saw in applications previously submitted, and I'm sorry I didn't include some of those other submittals, I probably should have done that in hindsight as that would have been useful for everybody, I apologize for that. But they proposed three variations of parking within the rail corridor, the mid-block rail corridor. So where they now are showing 31 spaces, I think they showed well over 100 spaces at one point. They did not show other sites for parking. They did not show any shared parking with off-site. They did not show any shared parking with other portions of the area which were formerly known as, or we currently know as the Pillsbury A-Mill Complex. There was only three variations on one theme, which was surface parking. They did not hear, get very good feedback that was very happy about that ... I'm sorry, I've decided not to speak English today. They did not receive positive feedback on those proposals. The neighborhood as well as staff and the commission at the time felt really strongly that that really destroyed the historic resource there. So in response they looked for other possibilities, one of which was below ground and which they proposed. Staff had concerns about the feasibility about that below ground parking previously. The applicants provided information how that could work, structurally we still had some concerns on the impact on other buildings which we had conditioned approval. They have not proposed any type of shared parking with the adjacent property owner, or developer, Doran.

Chair Larsen: Ok, Commissioner Haecker, you had a question? Alright, there we go ...

Lackovic: Just a question on lighting, just general site lighting. I know it has been identified in the parking area, but has there been any discussion, I didn't see any here, for the commercial parking ramp. They are proposing this is a pass through for general public to get from Second Street, through the site, through the other pathway, to Main Street. But I'm not seeing any lighting and I know lighting can be a real sensitive issue in historic districts, complexes, and I'm just wondering if there's been any discussion on lighting.

Staff Schaffer: Chair Larsen, Commissioner Lackovic, that's a great question. In your staff report, they do show the lighting that they propose within the mid-block rail corridor. That's an i-beam with a light fixture on it and you will see that scattered throughout the site. What the applicant is not showing us yet is how they are going to light the surface parking lot between the machine shop and the white grain elevators and I don't know how they are proposing to light the public stairs, which is that stair D. I can look back at the plans, but I don't believe it is in there. The applicant can speak to it, but I think that's a good question for the applicant and a good question to hold on to.

Chair Larsen: Ok, alright, other questions of staff at this time? Ok, I don't see any so we will open up the public hearing and we will ask the applicant to step forward.

Owen Metz: Chair Larsen, Commissioners, my name is Owen Metz and I'm with Dominion Development Acquisition, the developer on the A-Mill project. If it is alright, I'm going to steal a little time for this first CofA to give a little more overview. Brian did a good job and I commend him for all his work in sifting through this very complex project. Also I want to apologize for stealing Bob Mack from you guys. We hired him for some of his exterior consulting restoration skills and history on the site.

We have been working on this project for over a year and it has gone through a lot of different variations, not only in the site plan but in some of the proposed finishes in the site plan and then how to coordinate with Doran and continue to work very closely with them. So there's been a lot of thought not only by us but input and thought by the neighborhood and our neighbors at the site as well. We've spent about four months working with Marcy Holmes and the land use committee in meeting with them continually to get the site plan approved, which they have approved the site plan. We also spent several meetings working with CPED staff and then also SHPO, the National Park Service on a site visit, and numerous meetings to work through some of the issues that we identify as we are working. So I will point out, this is a photo from today, we've got (wis janny?) doing some exterior work at the building and doing (drafts?) to touch about 75% of the exterior at the A-Mill to help us guide our exterior restoration plans for the building. We've also had two previous HPC business meetings which we got very good feedback on and helped guide our application. We had two Planning Commission Committee of the Whole meetings which were very favorable and helped provide additional guidance to the plan before you. In addition we worked with the Soap Factory to design, I'll call it quarter of Fifth Avenue. So the design there, while it doesn't have their formal approval at this point, we continue to work with them to make sure that design and aspect of the site is coordinating with them. And then obviously continuing to work closely with the Doran team.

Quickly, the main project goal is obviously to save this beautiful, historic industrial building. It is a little ugly right now, but I think when we are done it will be pretty cool. We are converting into artist's apartments has been mentioned. There is a very cool water infrastructure that powered the building that is important to us to not only keep intact, but also to use to heat and cool the building. So the Mississippi River actually runs through the A-Mill and drops about 50 feet and goes back out on the down river side of St. Anthony Falls. So that is something that we've been very cognizant of and working very closely to make sure that we can maintain that area. The white silos, as mentioned, are historic and contributing and those will be retained in place. There is no real financially feasible use, so we will just maintain them in place and make sure they aren't going anywhere, which I think they won't but we will address those structural and monitoring plans as Brian suggested.

Finally, we've got the formal support of the Marcy Holmes Neighborhood Association, the Soap Factory, our neighbors just down the river, the Friends of the Mississippi River, the Preservation Alliance of Minnesota, and the National Trust for Historic Preservation. We've also worked closely with some other organizations to help guide the marketing and the design aspects of our building. So the other feedback that I think has been thrown around is that the project doesn't necessarily meet the comprehensive plan and how addressing the riverfront I think that the plan

in front of you would probably speak against that just on its merits alone. But the project is taking a lot of things into consideration and still trying to meet the historic requirements of the Secretary of Interior in order to be eligible for historic tax credits. The site is being designed to be very publicly accessible. The stair tower was a big thing coming on, where 4th Avenue used to be for the neighborhood. Making sure that aspect of the public access, not only the site is available but so that people can pass through the site. We will be forced to do that regardless, because we are sharing easements with Doran and the Soap Factory to access 5th Avenue and making sure that the site stays accessible.

Lastly, we are working on it, but there is an interpretive center, public museum, planned for the basement of the A-Mill to hopefully highlight some of that interpretive function. The water infrastructure that runs through the building today. And lastly, and a big thing, is the underground parking and making sure to incorporate that into our proposal. We understand that it concerns not only historically, but from the neighborhood in making this site be very aesthetically pleasing with a very industrial tone to it.

Moving on to the CofA on the rail corridor, unless anybody has any questions about the overview, I'll introduce some folks from BKV, our architecture team. We spent a lot of time working with the different stake holders to combine these three site plans and the different components of them into a single site plan. It includes shared access for pedestrians, cars, bicycles, while keeping it publicly accessible. I guess that's it. We are generally fine with all the conditions. You know, we understand we will have to come back for additional input to staff and come back for another public hearing for coordinating the site plan with Doran. We've already started that conversation with them to try and figure out what components we can make, to make sure it all has consistent and has a similar feel. It was purposely designed to be a little bit different to differentiate the old in the historic from the new and the modern. So there was a natural break where the former 5th Avenue was, so that was the design intent. To try to keep a different look but still have the industrial feel to it.

And then side lighting was mentioned. We're not far enough along in the drawings to have done the photometrics yet to determine where any inadequate spots of lighting would be, but that certainly will be addressed. And then the signage and master sign plan, we are fine with that. We understand we will have to come back for that, and the lovely Pillsbury's Best flour sign I know is a hot issue for a lot of people. The intent there, while it wasn't necessarily in the plans, but the intent is to refurbish that, have it lit up again, and actually convert it to an LED sign that has strip LED lights ... I have one in my bag if you ever want to look at it and plug it in and see it ... but it looks just like neon and has a longer lifespan so we don't have to have people up on the roof accessing that building. There's no parapet to it, it isn't the safest place to be to be out fixing a sign 12 stories up and then another 30 feet of sign. So I think that's all my notes from me. We are fine with removing the trees at the machine shop and also the courtyard redesign, we are fine readdressing that. So I'll turn it over to BKV, if you want to say anything, otherwise maybe David can just talk a little bit about the site plan.

David Motzenbecker: Sure, Chair Larsen, Commissioners, I really would just be happy to stand for any questions you have or clarifications on the site plan. As Owen said, we are really excited about the project and where's it has come over the past months with your feedback and the neighborhood's feedback and all of the folks that we've worked with. We are excited about what we have. Just a piece on the lighting, we are working on that and will ensure that it meets all the lighting standards. The custom fixtures are an I-beam with an off the shelf fixture that will be attached to it, spaced appropriately throughout the corridor. We'll also put some up on the machine shop parking lot and will look at appropriate, kind of, stair tower lighting and things like that to make sure everything is lit. Also some of those flower filter pieces, some of those may have some uplights in them for some accent lighting throughout the corridor as well. If there is any questions or clarifications, I know I passed along the paving materials for you to see. It is a great material, it has been used extensively. There is many extent examples of those types of pavers lasting a hundred-plus years on the east coast and even here. The most recent example of their use is surrounding the new library downtown. If you've walked by that, those are the same type of paver just a different aggregate mix. The aggregate mix was chosen and worked with staff on that to kind of reveal what might have been a ballast, a little riff abstraction on rail ballasts.

Chair Larsen: Is that grouted in place, or ...

David Motzenbecker: Not grouted in place, just set.

Chair Larsen: I think Commissioner Kelley has a question for you.

Kelley: Thank you very much. Do you think that you've had enough feedback or guidance from staff on the warehouse two courtyard, that wasn't really mentioned in your earlier remarks?

Owen Metz: yes, we actually are already thinking up some pretty, I'm excited, some interesting ideas on how we could better focus on those loading dock doors and make it work for both the new use and the historic interpretation. So I think we are quite comfortable with that condition.

Chair Larsen: Commissioner Haecker has a question.

Haecker: Maybe this is a question more for Mr. Metz, but how did the bank decide to split up the property?

Owen Metz: They didn't have any other offers for the historic buildings, so the intent was we came in and worked on the historic buildings. We actually first started working with Schaffer Richardson back in 2008, so we've been working with them to try to help them along and try to find another use that is something we are good at, which is utilizing the historic credits and low income housing tax credits which are being proposed in this project. So the short answer is there was no other proposals and Doran came forward to buy the remaining land and with their purchase agreement already in hand went to the bank and said why don't you sell us the rest of the historic buildings and worked through the negotiation with the bank.

Haecker: Ok, well I guess it stems from the coordinated site plan issue and where the property line is and who is going to do what paver and at what time. But then it also is a bigger issue in terms of parking and sort of the overall they kind of hemmed you in by saying well you buy those and figure out the parking later.

David Motzenbecker: It was certainly a challenge. I think that the underground parking that we have proposed gets us enough to make the project feasible and make our lenders and investors comfortable with it.

Haecker: Ok, thanks.

Chair Larsen: Commissioner Hunter Weir?

Hunter Weir: Could you talk a little bit about the water feature?

David Motzenbecker: Of course. The water feature, as Mr. Metz mentioned, the idea that the river is close by and we wanted a way to reveal that a little bit in the corridor piece. And again, highlight the existing rail tracks by creating a space in the middle of the block within the historic rail footprint. Just a very small, very shallow, almost a reflecting pool is what it would be of the water with some walkways over it that are in between those historic flower filters that we have set up there. Almost like a gallery of relics, it is very simple. A very plain reflecting, with a dark bottom so it will pull the sky down into that space.

Chair Larsen: Ok, other questions? Commissioner Mack?

L. Mack: David, could you talk about the trees?

David Motzenbecker: All the trees, or any particular spot?

L. Mack: In the rail corridor.

David Motzenbecker: In the rail corridor. That was something that we worked, again, with yourselves and with staff. We had much more originally, and understanding the historic nature and the kind of volunteer plantings that will arise in these types of industrial spaces, we scaled those back extensively and then replanted and having a few

in there to kind of represent where some might have come up voluntarily. So there is a small portion towards the warehouse two and then a few over by the stair coming down from the machine shop and then some as well in that sunken garden. But all were meant to be volunteer style plantings.

Chair Larsen: Commissioner Haecker?

Haecker: Is that same volunteer approach the vines creeping up the silos?

David Motzenbecker: Yes, all the plants were to kind of be made, the species were chosen to fit in that volunteer realm. I may just, if I may, between the rails, the greening that we are doing in the majority of the spaces is a creeping thyme so that when people are walking throughout the corridor, that is a plant that is very tough and can take a lot of foot traffic and still survive and thrive. So that's its place, and it also has a great fragrance, so it brings up some fragrance as you are walking on it. So that's placed judiciously throughout the corridor between the rail tracks closer to warehouse two and in the sunken relic garden we are showing some short grass, kind of native prairie, planting, so there will be some grasses and some native plantings which would reflect something that the breeze would blow in with seeds and would just kind of voluntarily arise. And those are a little bit taller, about 18 inches in height.

Haecker: I know I read it, but I can't remember, What is the species of the vine, the growing vine?

David Motzenbecker: I think we were having some angleman or some boss vine, I'm trying to remember ... just something very quick growing.

Chair Larsen: Commissioner Lackovic.

Lackovic: Just a couple of things, but as long as we are on trees and vines I'll just keep going with that one for a second. Typically the creeping vines, Virginia Creeper, that sort of thing, can be very damaging to masonry. Is this, do we know that this is going to be ok and not cause problems for the concrete silos?

Owen Metz: Well we never know, I guess.

Lackovic: One of the things I'm wondering is it better to provide some kind of wire mesh or something that it grows on instead of the concrete.

David Motzenbecker: We can do that, and we are doing that in some instances with the smaller kind of screen elements in the corridor. The vines are not something that I am wed to on the concrete elevators. If that is a concern for the commissioners, that was just something that we felt would bring some vitality and life to the space. If there is an overwhelming concern that that is a detriment, that's not a concern to remove those from against the elevators.

Lackovic: It would be, I mean it is one of those things, we typically pull it off as soon as it grows because, one, it attracts water and the little suckers actually do penetrate and start to do some damage to the surface. So I would be very cautious about implementing that on the concrete elevators. That would be my perspective, someone who has a stronger landscape background can comment on that, but ... to track down the vegetation, that will kind of lead me into another question. Maybe you can clarify this and maybe you can't, but the corridor between the central rail corridor on Second Avenue, in the phasing plans it is the last thing that gets developed and it looks like it is part of Doran's final property and yet it is showing up on your site plan with your name on it for the design. So, and the property line is often drawn straight down the middle of that, so who exactly is controlling the design of that strip.

David Motzenbecker: That's a great question.

Chair Larsen: Which strip are you talking about?

David Motzenbecker: The connection from the rail corridor down to Main Street between the Red Tile and ...the property line is towards the A-Mill side of that stair. And so most of the stair is in Doran's property. Right now, they

are controlling the design. That design that you see in there was from Doran, just we are showing it in there for reference at this point so that you can understand that the goal is almost like a Spanish steps, grand connection down to the river from that corridor. And we will be working in concert with them as it moves forward with their Phase 2 to make sure that that is realized. But yes, that's shown in there for reference at this point.

Lackovic: Ok, that makes sense because I know that is probably the fuzziest area in the site, that little arm wrestling zone in between the two properties ultimately. But, again, going back to the trees, there are trees shown there and I don't know that I would encourage that either. If the intent, which as far as I can see, the intent is to interpret that space, use that space not only for public access but to help interpret the Red Tile elevators which the opportunity may be lost if we plant trees along the side of it. You are losing the closest access point that anybody is ever going to have to those Red Tile elevators and it is a position that we haven't been able to get too close to for close to a hundred years. So it is one of those where I would probably shy away from tall plantings in front of the tiles elevators just because I think it limits the ability to actually experience and interpret that construction in that zone. Which is why I was asking who is controlling that, because ... but that's close to your property edge.

David Motzenbecker: Umhummm, Chair Larsen, Commissioner Lackovic, there are four trees shown that are on our property that are very close to the Red Tile. They are a very skinny, vertical birch tree and the intent there, knowing the great hue of the Red Tile itself, was to almost kind of tuck them in between where the curve, the arc of the elevator comes into that joint, kind of tuck them into those spaces, so they would kind of be between those rounded portions and give a great, especially in the fall, a great contrast of yellow against that red. And bring a little bit of life in there too. The intent wasn't to cover up the Red Tile at all, but to enhance and really focus people's attention by that contrast. You can also see, to that stair question too, at the top of it what we are doing with some of those flower filter frames is setting up almost a view framer down those stairs so we have some of those flower filter frames kind of on each side of that stair going down that we're envisioning kind of will set up that view down. And we would love to eventually, as well, work with the Park Board to either relocate or possibly add some of the relics that are down in the park already to refocus those on the bottom of those stairs so it is a draw kind of through that gateway and down the stairs into the park.

Chair Larsen: Alright, does anybody have any questions on the sunken garden or anything like that? Commissioner Lackovic still has some questions.

Lackovic: There is a couple things along the back side of the A-Mill, I'll come back to the sunken garden, but the one thing that I noticed that is kind of interesting is the transformer and generator on top of the flat rail car. Is that just a, is that feasible?

David Motzenbecker: We're still trying to ... I may defer to my colleague, he has been working with that more than I have. At this point, we're hoping it is but not 100% sure per code that it could be elevated like that, so it is still in flux right now but it would be really cool if we could do it that way.

Lackovic: I think so too, it is the hardest thing to do is to hide those things. They're ugly and they're huge and it is difficult to hide, but if it looks like it has just arrived on a train, it is probably the least offensive way of handling that. So if you can make it work, I just thought that was really kind of a clever thing if you can pull it off. You need a rail car, and that would tell you that you need to keep those rail lines intact too so you can get it in. But now, I'll transition over to the sunken gardens. And again, it comes back to trees and lighting for me on that. I think, again, you're intention to excavate that and do it correctly with the archaeology component, what a great idea and I hope we find all kinds of stuff down there that you can actually use for this. Again my concern would be putting trees down there that obscure the view than into it. I would say keep the planting short so that you actually are interpreting that as a sunken area that you can see in. The one concern that I had was the wall mounted lighting panels, just because of the uplighting and the probability of a lot of excess light kind of coming out of this sunken space. That might be a little too much light? Something that you would probably have to mock up, and you are probably not there yet, but something to consider that just an uncontrolled wall panel lighting, back lit panel, might be, produce a little bit more glare than you want in a situation like that. A more subtle lighting that is contained in the area may be more effective. That was just the one red flag I saw there, the trees and the lighting.

David Motzenbecker: As we've looked at that farther, or further, I tend to agree with you about the trees and I think that the trees there might be something we might take out as well. Just from a design standpoint, the more that we looked at it, it took away. So I would agree with you on that point. For the panel lighting, we are still working through that. We are working with a company, they are intended to be these resin panels that have pieces of wheat impregnated in them so kind of recalling what was coming through the trains and moving into the A-Mill through those vertical and horizontal elements. The resin panels are going to be a kind of opaque or coated on the back. My goal is to not have cleat plates coming out of that relic area. It is to be real soft light, almost like a nightlight that glows subtly at night and you can see some of the reflection and the shadows of the wheat in those spaces, but isn't very bright. So I would agree with you there, and our goal is to not have it be bright shining out of those spaces. And the rails itself, I just wanted to highlight that, the catwalk is in line with the historic rail track in that space. We wanted to kind of continue that and pull it over and use it almost like a gallery that could be curated with some of these relics.

Lackovic: That's a great idea. And the lighting, I'm fascinated by it, and again if it is not too overpowering in that location, it is great. And I also think that could be a real effective way for your wayfinding. Something that is very unique and specific to the district that you could use to the district as wayfinding points.

David Motzenbecker: That's a great idea.

Lackovic: If it doesn't work in the garden, if it doesn't work there, there may be other opportunities to introduce it that would help people find their way through a not-so-intuitive plot.

Chair Larsen: Ok, other questions before we see if there are other people who wish to speak to the application? Alright, I don't see any ... so is there anybody that wishes to speak for or against the application please step forward one at a time. State your name and address for the record, clearly into the microphone.

Rob Stanek: Good evening, Commissioners, my name is Rob Stanek. Thank you for your service.

Chair Larsen: If you could give us your address, please, it is required.

Rob Stanek: Thank you, for your service, I appreciate it. My address is 222 2nd Street SE in Minneapolis. I'm a lifelong resident of Minneapolis. I'd like to make three points in opposition of the parking variance, but before I do that could I ask three clarifying questions? I just want to make sure, on page 9 of the CPED report, there is 290 parking spots that are required for the historic parking ratio, that's correct, right, I read that. And I think when we talk about these big numbers I think it helps to put it into perspective and percentages. So as I read through page 10 there was no chart but as I calculated it, it looked like there was 152 parking spots, I'm sorry, 254 parking spots out of a required 290. So to me that is about 70% of the required historic parking ratio. I think we are in agreement on that? Ok, so out of that 204, 152 of those, or about 75% are under ground and the other 25% are surface parking spots. Do I have that right? I just want to make sure.

Chair Larsen: You can provide your facts, we're not here to respond directly to you so you can interpret the facts.

Rob Stanek: Well I'm asking a question, is that accurate in the percentages?

Chair Larsen: If, if you ...

Rob Stanek: Ok, the second clarifying point I'd like to make, or try to get, because this is going to be another clarifying question, is on page 10 of the CPED report. The report mentions at the very top of the page, it does mention that there is two public parking entities within a couple block radius. Does that mean it is open to public parking or does that mean it is city owned? I know it is open to public parking, but I'm more curious who owns those parking ramps. Is it private, they are private entities are they not? The CPED report doesn't mention it, and if we are relying at all on the fact that to grant the parking variance that there are parking spots, parking ramps in the immediate two block area, and if they are privately owned, that makes a, I think that is an important point. Because if anything, the A-Mill has taught us that things change and development plans change. So if those are privately

owned, I think it does matter. So, does anybody know if those two parking structures that are mentioned in the CPED report are public or private? I know you can't answer but it is something to consider. I think they are private, I don't know that for a fact though. And then, third, I live in Marcy Holmes neighborhood, but I am on the border of the Nicollet Island East Bank Neighborhood Association. I think it is important to know that Nicollet Island has issued a resolution not in favor of this parking resolution and there are a growing group of neighbors in Marcy Holmes that live close and around the riverfront and the other side of the river in the Mill Ruins district that would oppose this parking variance. So those are three points. Now I'll wrap it up and I'll take about 2 or 3 minutes. Ok? The first point, I'm confused, if the building is so important to save, and I do believe it is, but if it is so important to save at any cost, as stated by a Dominion representative at a Marcy Holmes meeting one night, why isn't it important enough to make sure that the historic parking ratio is met? Said another way, if the buildings are important enough to save, isn't it important enough to make sure that the parking ratios are there for the historic district? Second, to grant the parking variance I think sets a very bad precedence specifically in this neighborhood. The neighborhood is under parking pressures every, increasing parking pressures every month. Especially in light if we are relying on privately owned parking ramps in the neighborhood to supply parking, they might not be there. Again, development happens, things change. And in fact I would question whether there aren't already development plans for one, for this specific parking ramp. Not the surface lot, but the parking ramp itself. And then third, and this is my final point, the CPED report states that one of their findings was that it is an undue hardship for the developer. I'm assuming that is an economic hardship to grant the parking variance? If that's the case, I would suggest that maybe another finding could be that maybe this isn't the right development because of economics. Thank you.

Chair Larsen: Thank you, is there anybody else that wishes to speak either for or against this application, please step forward at this time. Don't be shy.

Edna Brazatis: I'm never shy. I consider myself a fun person, ok? Commissioners, my name is Edna Brazatis and I live at 4A Grove Street in Minneapolis. I am here in my capacity as a farmer, 20 year Pillsbury employee, and also as a representative of the Friends of the Riverfront. I had sort of a series of mishaps, I came very prepared but I left my materials at home. So my first part that I really wanted to impart to you is I have been following this project for close to a decade and I have to tell you from really deep in my heart how much I appreciate all the work that the commission has done, that the people before you have done, on this project. And I really appreciate what the staff has done, in particular Brian Schaffer, who I think really gave us a comprehensive view of this facility. I know that maybe 30 years before, we wouldn't have been looking at this site in this way. We would just be looking at the building and the architectural elements. But what Brian and Jack has done is told us this is our heritage.

We have to look at the whole complex to understand what happened there. I worked for Pillsbury for 20 years and this site was active until the very end. I started out wanting to talk a little bit about what was considered warehouse 3 which was the R&D facility, and just to give you a little bit of human side to it, it was the bakery R&D facility and the creations that came out of there made the cake boss look like a piker. And some of the people who worked there were the Woullet brothers, ok? And I know in previous times, and I know it is not going to be that way this evening, that you've been going on to midnight, and blood sugar is low, so I was going to have these in the hall for my friends and for the audience and other people in case there was a crisis, but I see this evening we are not going to go that way.

Going into my broad view of this, what is really important is that we have a unique opportunity and I think that Commissioner Lackovic talked about it, to look and interpret this site. The part of our job in the Heritage Preservation Commission world, is also education and preserving our cultural heritage. And it is more than just buildings. So one of the things that is available at this site is the ability to have public access. I think you talked about this, that this is the first time in a hundred years that you can get close to the Red Tile elevator. And so I hope as we go forward that we understand that there are now three public access points that are proposed. One of them is from 2nd Street between the white concrete elevator and the machine shop. What I'd like staff to do is to look and that and make sure that it is welcoming and open. That all the design elements are there to indicate that the public can come through. Another of the entrance places of course is on 3rd Avenue between the buildings, in the rail corridor. And the third one is going to be what is supposed to be 4th Street, and I think Commissioner Haecker mentioned it that this is sort of a disputed turf. We don't know who is going to own it but it is crucial to the public's appreciation of this site. And why is this so important? It is to see and understand these historic elements, but it is

also the fact that what Brian has brought out is that there was a rail corridor here. And one of the things that is missing in the St. Anthony Historic District is really a chance for us to understand the importance of rail transportation. This district was filled with rail lines and they're not there any longer. And I kind of thought of my mother who was an elementary school teacher and she came home, like 45 years ago, and she said "my god, I talked to my students and they think that chocolate milk comes from chocolate cows and white milk comes from white cows." Right now, without having these visual things, we can't tell how this happened. Obviously water power was important, but the transportation, the rail, the tariffs, the ways to get in there, was really crucial in keeping this to be a real powerhouse. So I am hoping that staff would add a few extra conditions. I don't know where these go, if they go in our coordinated site plan or if I get my opportunity to do them now, but I want to tell you that I had all these printed out with three copies but they are at home. But I wanted to add a couple conditions and some of them would be regarding the possibility for interpretation. So I would like CPED staff to work with the applicant to ensure that the public access to the interior of the A-Mill complex from 2nd Street, 3rd Avenue, and proposed 4th Avenue is designed in a way that conveys it is open and welcome to the public, and that public access is encouraged. The public access points will be signed as such and will not be gated. What I found sometimes, and unfortunately over time, people forget that these were intended to be public access points. Gates get built and people forget that they really can go through there. Second, I appreciate that the applicant is going to use artifacts from the A-Mill and I think that it is important for us to understand what they are. I don't quite know what the flower filters are that they are suggesting. They are a part of this A-Mill and we need to get this information recorded and understood while there are still people alive who know about it. I would be willing to let them know a couple names, one is William Hay who is a Vice President of milling and the other is Dick Farrell who was A-Mill manager. I would like CPED to work with the applicant to ensure that artifacts from the A-Mill that are used as decorative elements are properly labeled with the description of their function. And third, I would like the applicant, if asked, to work with the St. Anthony Heritage Board, CPED staff, or other preservation organizations to allow QR codes or other technology for interpretation of this site. This is an important public site, it is a national historic monument, I mean landmark, and I appreciate all the work that you've done. Thank you very much, and I'll leave this handwritten copy with the clerk.

Chair Larsen: Thank you.

Doug Carlson: Mr. Chair, Commissioners, my name is Doug Carlson and I'm the president of the Marcy Holmes Neighborhood Association. My residence is at 424 5th Avenue SE, just over 2 blocks from the back corner of warehouse 2. With me tonight are multiple members of our board, despite the fact that our board is meeting as we stand here before you, probably without a quorum. We wanted to be with you tonight for consideration of this project, and certainly for our neighborhood and probably for the whole state. You may have in your files a letter that I wrote to our councilmember and sent to other council members, and if not I will forward it to you. It reviews the process that we went through extensively through our land use committee, actually the code chair of our land use committee is here with us in addition to one of our land use members who is an architect by profession, and another board member who is here and is a resident of the Phoenix condominiums just across the street from the mill. Land use went through extensive review of the project and continues to go through reviews with developers. Our board voted strongly in favor of this project, with only one dissenting vote and two abstentions from board members who were quite new and didn't feel like they should vote in this matter. So it has very strong support in the neighborhood.

Chair Larsen: sorry to interrupt, but I will let you know that we do have these in our packets.

Doug Carlson: You do, thank you. Our support continues to be strong as we are updated on the project and we encourage your careful consideration as timely as possible. We understand that intruders are being chased out of these buildings virtually every week. We worry about them, and we want things to move ahead as quickly as possible. Thank you, and I encourage your support.

Chair Larsen: Thank you very much. Alright is there anybody else that wishes to speak for or against.

John Crippen: Hello, John Crippen, 4952 17th Avenue South. I want to echo some of the comments to the last two presenters. I work at the Minnesota Historical Society and for a number of years was director of Mill City Museum. That is still in my area of influence at my work at the Historical Society. I'm not here to talk about the technical

specifications, I think between the commission and the staff you guys have that well covered, I'm confident. So I'll leave that to you, but kind of echoing Ms. Brazatis' comments I appreciate the staff's requirement in particular about having a comprehensive site plan. I think that is essential for one of these things, and those of us who are operating the Mill City Museum, aka the Washburn A Mill across the river, we've been watching and hoping for the success of the Pillsbury A and not without understanding the complexities of a project like this. It's not an easy thing to do, so I'm here mostly just to echo the stress of the importance of preserving this important complex of buildings, pointing out that it is a vital companion to the Washburn A. We've got two national landmarks facing each other across the river and we want to keep it that way and be able to have them work together. So we are here to see it safe, as the previous speaker said, we are eager to see it used and treasured by the community. So partly this is a pep talk as well, the challenges are considerable but they are worth meeting, I think. And finally I want to echo Ms. Brazatis' comments about public access and I was glad to hear her detail the three areas she's seen because she has studied this closely. I wasn't, on quick review of the plans, I wasn't completely sure what all the public access points were and so I just want to stress as you are thinking about the approvals that you keep that in mind. And think of it in the broadest way possible. Thinking about public access so that people can see these as mill structures and they can understand that milling history. Keeping in mind, I don't think it is on the table for this evening, but whatever the designs, whatever the developments, keep open options into the future for opening up tailrace tunnels or water power tunnels. That's one of the things that we haven't been able to do successfully on the west side, but there's a great opportunity. Again, many, many challenges, but there is a great opportunity here to let people see up close and personal how the water power worked. And then think about not just the public pass through, but what other public experiences might be made possible that could compliment the experience that we created at Mill City Museum. We do in fact have a rail corridor in the Washburn A Mill and a rail car. So people do get a sense of that rail history but you can always have more. So we could give you some advice on that as well. In any case, I don't need to belabor that but thinking in the broadest possible terms whenever you are looking at any design considerations, how do we make this possible for public access. One of the instructive lessons almost 10 years later now with Mill City Museum that might be worth looking at, that mill complex was also designed for public flow through, as recently described ... (gap due to tape ending) ... Mill City Museum and some doors, they don't think "oh, this is a place for me to walk down to the river" even though it was designed, you can walk for free without buying a ticket, in the front door on 2nd down to the river. So it matters how you design the doorways, how you encourage people one way or another to know that this is a welcoming place for them. So I just encourage you to think of those things as well. Thank you very much.

Chair Larsen: Thank you. Alright, is there anybody else, please step forward.

Jo Radzwill: It's kind of an echo of some of the things that have been said, but I have a few different adjectives to throw in there as well. I'm Jo Radzwill and I am co-chair of the Marcy Holmes Land Use Committee. My address is 507 2nd Avenue SE. In regard to all the open accesses, the public accesses, I think it is really important to keep them open, safe, and very inviting, so that everybody is well aware that they are there for the public use. Thank you.

Chair Larsen: Thank you, is there anybody else who wishes to speak for or against?

Chelle Stoner: Hi, my name is Chelle Stone and I am a Phoenix resident and am also on the board of directors of the Phoenix building at 222 2nd Street SE. I also would like to echo how important public access and being invited in is important to the A-Mill structure. I am a strong believer in great story telling. I think Mr. Schaffer in one of his documents suggested how important the rail corridors were to telling the story of the A-Mill and we've told the story so well on the other side of the river, I think it's great that we just put an exclamation point on it and tell it again and tell it really well. And I think if we want to tell it well and have it reflect the hundred million dollars that is going into it that the space also include, the site, also include plans more than just retaining the silos, which doesn't sound very permanent. I think that there ought to be an inclusion for approval for the whole site only if it includes some preservation of the silos, because I think that the silos are required to tell the story well. Also I think that if we have public access, significant public access, and invite in a lot of people, it is going to require parking. I have a letter here that is from the board of the Phoenix, the board of directors of the Phoenix building which is 72, or I think 72 residents now, asking, joining with NIEBA, I don't know how to say that, Nicollet Island East Bank Association, requesting that the HPC commissioners deny the parking variance sought by Dominion. Historic St. Anthony is going to continue, if we are going to continue to develop as a regional and national historic site, to visit people are

going to need to park there to come to the site. And 86 more parking sites used by A-Mill residents on our streets is really going to impact our retailers and our restaurateurs and our movie goers, which has a lot to do with the livability of our neighborhood. And I have a letter here, and I don't know if I give it to the clerk ...

Chair Larsen: Yup, to the clerk.

Chelle Stoner: Ok, those are my concerns, thank you very much.

Chair Larsen: Thank you. Is there anybody else that wishes to speak, please step forward.

Larry Prinns: My name is Larry Prinns, I live at 517 8th Avenue SE and I have been a resident of Marcy Holmes for about 21 years. I am a MH board member and also serve on the land use subcommittee and we've been working with Dominium and Owen very closely here. I am in complete support of all 5 Certificates of Appropriateness. I think it has the potential to be a great project and will really unify the whole historic district. As a land use member, we pushed the applicant pretty hard to honor the rail corridor by minimizing surface parking and by maximizing public access. We also pushed them for a coordinated site plan in arrangement with Doran. As evidenced by our support, which I think you have the letter, and we weren't disappointed. They are continuing to work with Doran on a coordinated plan as everybody has stated here tonight. They reduced the parking and the public access has just improved as we started looking at it this year. So I'm pleased, the board is pleased, the neighborhood is pleased. The significance of this property is so obvious I don't need to go into that, and as it's continued deterioration is evident, swift action is what is really needed to get this thing through before more pieces fall off and have to extend the protected fence out further and block traffic. So I urge your support on all these things. Thank you.

Chair Larsen: Thank you very much, is there anybody else that wishes to speak either for or against, please step forward. Ok, seeing none we will close the public hearing. Commissioners? Obviously a lot of ideas kind of thrown out through the public hearing with a little bit of Q&A added in there. What's your pleasure? Commissioner Kelley, I see a flag, is that yours?

Kelley: Yes, I didn't want to motion yet, I was just going to propose and see if the commissioners were amenable. We heard a lot about site access and I certainly feel strongly about that myself. That is really essential and we want to make it inviting and safe and if possible, not gated. And I was thinking that that would be a good thing to fold into condition 1, because that is asking for the coordinated site plan. We could say with an emphasis or something on site access, or possibly it would be another condition. And I also wanted to ask Commissioner Lackovic if she thought that additional wording on plantings would be appropriate to add to condition number 3. That's all.

Lackovic: Oh, I don't know if it would go with three. To me when I read through it, that's more about structural monitoring. In the event of excessive vibration from construction, so I think that the plantings are a slightly different topic.

Chair Larsen: More like number 5?

Lackovic: Yes, I think I would maybe put that in with number 5, just saying that plantings need to be considered so that they don't cause any additional damage to existing historic structures.

Chair Larsen: Yes, I would just comment, that was my question also, was the vines. Knowing that, I appreciate the applicant's desire to have some screening on a large white structure, but at the same time, as we talk about preservation of those in the long term, we don't know what the long term plan will be. They could be there for many, many years. And so to invite deterioration through a simple thing that could be prevented, I like the idea of screening and I'm not sure what the right options is, but maybe there are some other options or some mesh or something that is an alternative out there, but I would agree.

Lackovic: It is just something that typically it is the first thing we do when we've got a masonry building is we strip all the plant growth and biologicals off. Not only do they attract moisture but they can be physically damaging. But you've already taken that point, but I think we could add that ...

Chair Larsen: I think we could just say vines on the white grain elevators are not approved. Alright, and then were you looking for feedback, Commissioner Kelley, on the ...

Kelley: One other thing, we heard a little bit, I think at least one or two of testimonies, mentioned the white silos, that they might need something a little bit more proactive than remain, and I don't know, I'm not sure whether I agree with that yet and I was kind of soliciting input from commissioners as to whether it was felt those were in danger. I didn't get any words about that in any of the staff report, but whether anything more was needed or would that just muddy the water?

Chair Larsen: Would you like to address that, Commissioner Tableporter?

Tableporter: I guess I'm not, on a development this significant and this complicated, I'm kind of accustomed working in the UK for a long time, to seeing a master plan and typically with a master developer, especially with two separate ownerships. So I kind of, in thinking about the coordinated site plan, which I think is a great idea, I was also trying to think about what is missing, because we saw pieces being represented. To me there was a number of things, it brings up the grain towers, there is some remaining bridges and we haven't discussed the treatment of those. I think the developer discussed the hydro and what we could do with lighting and signage. I think signage is mentioned, but the others are not and I'm wondering if we couldn't extend the coordinated site plan to include some of those other elements so that when it comes back to the HPC we can be seeing it more in its entirety. That would certainly make me more comfortable and I welcome comments from other commissioners on whether that is an idea.

Chair Larsen: Commissioner Lackovic?

Lackovic: I think that is a great idea. I think part of what we are struggling with, everybody, is what exactly is a coordinated site plan? I think if we specified some of the elements that need to be coordinated, that just gets us that much closer. There's always been, from the beginning of this, this temptation to separate the new from the old. But the reality is that the site is all, the building is new, Mill and Main is new, but the site is not new and there is really no reason to separate the two. So it needs to be coordinated at every level and I think any little detail that shows a demarcation there ruins the effect of the complex. So I think we can stress that by adding, I think that's a good point.

Chair Larsen: Commissioner Lindberg?

Lindberg: I think it has been wonderful to see the cooperation amongst all the teams here, and so we can definitely see that in the letters of support, the different groups, and it has been great to see the changes over the past year. I definitely like this parking option much better than the last one that we saw. To Ms. Brazatis' point of the interpretation, that was one thing that she mentioned, maybe that is just something that we could fold into the comprehensive site plan. The developers seemed to be nodding when you guys, when she was talking about having the little signs and QR codes, and maybe that is something you could pop in and address because you guys have been great about listening to the neighborhoods and what they like, so pop that in there and that might address a piece, as a suggestion. And I definitely like the open access points. I know that on the other bank, everybody kind of goes down the Guthrie steps and know that it is ok to go down there, but it is really hard to figure out other places to get to the river. And I love the idea of not having gates, of having that signage saying it is ok, come down here, find your way, so I think that would be helpful in the signage plan. And then number 2, for clarification, where we ask for sensitively excavating archaeology in the sunken garden, are we asking that to expand the length of the white elevators? The reason being if there is going to be so much soil taken up for the underground parking, are we asking for archaeology just for the sunken garden or are we asking for it to run the length. Because what it does say is "and other areas identified with archaeological potential." I know when I read ...

Chair Larsen: So, it is two sentences. There is the Phase 1 archaeological assessment for CPED for review, that will be for the whole site. And the plan should also include a process for sensitively excavating archaeology in the site of the sunken garden or other areas identified.

Lindberg: Right, but I was wondering if they are doing, with the sensitive excavating of archaeology, if that should also extend for the underground parking lot?

Chair Larsen: So they're going to ...

Lindberg: So, I was just wondering for clarification, do you see what I'm saying?

Chair Larsen: I do, I think that's covered. So basically, we know that they are going to be digging in the sunken garden. We don't know that Phase I, we will figure out the entire site and any areas where there is identified that that would become a sensitive excavating around an archaeological potential.

Lindberg: Clarified, thank you.

Chair Larsen: Ok, Commissioner Mack.

L. Mack: I just have some language to recommend for point 1.

Larsen: Wonderful.

L. Mack: For the, it, I think it is interesting because I think our site, our interest in a coordinated site plan is so focused on preserving the real corridor that these other issues of public access have not been totally addressed and I expect that they will be as the plans develop. I mean I think this has moved along very quickly and it is amazing how much you all have done so far. So, but just at some point, there should be a coordinated site plan that presents a consistent treatment of the mid block and Main St SE rail spur corridors for the entire Pillsbury A-Mill complex and ensures the public access to the complex is clear and inviting. The site plan should address lighting, signage, and interpretation.

Lackovic: I think we should specify which are the access points as well so that is clear. The entry point at the parking ramp off of Second Street, a mid-block access point at 3rd Avenue, and the mid-block ...

Larsen: Well one ...

L. Mack: Well, I would guess that the site plan will make clear what ...

Larsen: Right, we could get ...

Lackovic: That's an assumption.

Larsen: Yes, but if they didn't ...

L. Mack: Well, if it doesn't, we have a chance to look at it at that point.

Larsen: Yes, I think in that sense we have given, we are giving ...

L. Mack: This is what we want to see and we will see it.

Larsen: We are giving feedback saying we are withholding support based on these items and so, yes, I mean I had some similar things, a coordinated site plan to address lighting, public access, hydrological resources, resource interpretation ...

L. Mack: What we want to avoid is having them come back and cover two and not have the same ...

Larsen: In which case we deny the ...

Lackovic: (unclear)

Larsen: That's why they won't do it.

L. Mack: I'm a little reluctant to put the hydrological interpretation in there just because of timing. I mean, that's a big issue that is going to be ... I mean, I know the St. Anthony Falls Heritage Board is doing, trying, wanting to fund a feasibility study. It is something ...

Larsen: It is separated out to hydrological resources, which they can give us a plan, and the plan might be we don't know enough yet, but at the same time that keeps it on track.

L. Mack: Ok, sure.

Larsen: And then there is the resource interpretation which can go to the sunken garden, which can go to other aspects in terms of signage and how to coordinate with other vested partners.

L. Mack: Umhummm, ok.

Tableporter: Does the treatment of the grain towers need something additional because its not really mentioned.

Larsen: It's not mentioned currently. I think it is one of those things where the intent is to leave it as is. There is no requirement to do anything.

Tableporter: Should that be part of the plan then, (unclear).

Larsen: The maintenance and that kind of thing Ok, one of the elements that kind of came out of that too, was, for me, sort of piggy backing onto that, was a phasing and implementation plan. So we have a lot of different, we have to recognize that all of these things can't be done all at once, but something along the lines of a phasing and implementation plan to indicate the roles and responsibilities for implementation, let's see, phasing and implementation plan to indicate roles and responsibilities of a coordinated design plan for implementation and maintenance.

Tableporter: That's in addition to this A-Mill phasing plan, but it addresses the additional (unclear)

Larsen: Well, in that sense I want it to be clear who is doing what so that we can see, that we will see, a plan that looks similar over the whole complex and it will identify who is responsible so when something is not done we know who to go after, so to speak, but they'll do it, so we won't have to. Alright, other concerns? Ok, Commissioner Lackovic?

Lackovic: This isn't really a concern but point 7 on here, the stair for the parking ramp, that by city code would require, if we assume that this is a façade, would require some window treatment, or a window opening there. I guess I just wanted to invite some conversation here as to whether that is an appropriate interpretation of a façade. To me it is not really a building, it is a, the stair tower, it is just another one of these structures on the site. I don't know that I would give it building status and then require it to have 30% openings.

Larsen: Here's, I think one of the big concerns is safety. So you are now exiting a stair tower with no door, no light, no window onto a public street.

Lackovic: There should be light.

Larsen: Well, no window onto a public street, so now you've got, you are exiting a stairwell onto a street that you can't see onto, and so you don't know who is out there or where they are. And that's the purpose.

Lackovic: (unclear). The way this is oriented, the door opens to the side which is a public sidewalk. I don't know that having a view to the street is going to provide you any more safety or satisfaction if someone is coming from behind unless the whole thing was glass, then you could say you know who is coming at you. But I guess that was one of the things that I actually thought that having a more solid façade made more sense in that do you really want to look down a utilitarian stair, they're not attractive. And to me we are inviting more trouble than we need to there. With a solid façade, I go back to the wayfinding and it provides a surface that you could use to tell the public that here is your entry point, here is where you want to come in. It's not a barricade, it's not a barrier. This could be, what I'm trying to do is make it so that it is a useful structure instead of something that just pops up in the middle of a parking ramp. So taking it and using that as part of the entry system, I almost want to flip it and put it on the side towards the white grain elevators, if that's the public route, I almost want to stick it on that side and have it be part of the entry sequence. Part of that come here and welcome here this is where you want to be. Instead of treating it like just the way of getting out of the parking ramp. So just something I thought I would bring up one more time. It's such a small element of the whole overall project, and yet it is in one of those key public access points that it probably deserves a little more treatment than just a stair tower.

Larsen: Commissioner Mack.

L. Mack: I'd have trouble inserting something that said that they should not meet the requirements of our own zoning code, so I would just leave it as is but keep it in our minds as they come back with the site plan and see how it all kind of fits together at that point.

Lackovic: We're not necessarily in defiance of our zoning code, because it in itself is not a building, it is a piece of a building who has got a façade on the opposite side. Because it is set into a hill, there is no façade on that side, the façade is facing the A-Mill. So I don't know that we are necessarily in ...

Larsen: It's part of the parking ramp, so it is part of the structure of the property which is a building.

Lackovic: Which is a building that has no façade on that side because it is pushed into a hill.

Larsen: Right, but it has the same ...

Lackovic: The opposite has ... it has lots of openings and would meet that requirement for the 30%

Larsen: Because it was open on the hillside?

Lackovic: No, the opposite side where it has a façade you can do your 30%, but you put your façade into a hillside and the façade is below ground and you can't have windows. I would say that it's not necessarily in violation, I don't know what extent (unclear)

Haecker: I can point out a lot of instances where there is some gray area in the zoning, in the codes, but I can think of a lot of parking garages that I've walked out of that don't have windows but to your point of it being solid, I get that. I think it could really just be either all solid or all glass or one or the other. The safety issues are there, but that's I guess in terms of being 30% and meeting that code, I guess it remains to be interpreted by zoning I imagine. Or, not zoning, but ...

Larsen: Ok, Commissioner Hunter Weir. Thank you for being patient.

Hunter Weir: Well this isn't something I was going to say but now that we have had this conversation I would say that flat façade looks to me that the perfect surface for graffiti and I would argue, I can see that becoming kind of a nightmare because of its location. So I think there is a case to be made for some windows. I think it is also, the other points I wanted to reinforce, was doing something to take care of those, the white concrete storage units because of the number of times, and I know this is nobody's intent, but the number of times that we've had to approve demolitions through neglect, where something is in such bad condition that everybody's back is to the wall and there is nothing that can be done to be saved, so just being mindful of that. And also very much the notion of labeling

some of these things because as somebody who does not come from a milling family, much of what I know, I know because of what I've read in all these reports. But if I was to be seeing something, I'd be sort of hard pressed to say what it is exactly I am seeing because it really is not part ... in addition to which I think those kinds of things can be incredibly fun and what I'm thinking of is if you've been in the Midtown Global Market, they have a framed footprint in the floor where somebody stepped in concrete in 1928 and they tell you what it is you are seeing. There is just a little thing there that says you are looking at the footprint of somebody who actually built this building. And those kinds of things I think really humanize these kinds of sites, so whatever can be done to help people like me know what I'm seeing can be very helpful. Thank you.

Larsen: Alright, anybody else? Ok, I'll make a motion that we, the Heritage Preservation Commission adopt the above findings and approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the site plan, parking structure, and treatment of the Great Northern Rail Spur Corridor within the Pillsbury A Mill Complex located at 300 2nd Street SE, 400 Second Street SE, and 100 3rd Avenue SE with the following conditions:

1. Modification of number 1 to read: The applicant shall submit a coordinated site plan that presents a consistent treatment of the Mid Block and Main Street SE Rail Spur Corridors and street connections for the entire Pillsbury A Mill complex. The coordinated site plan shall include addressing lighting, public access, hydrological resources, resource interpretation, maintenance, and maintenance of white grain elevators. The phasing and implementation plan to indicate roles and responsibilities for the coordinated plan and implementation and maintenance of those features. The coordinated and consistent site plan requires review and approval by the HPC in a public hearing prior to any building permit issuance.
2. Remains the same
3. Same
4. Same
5. Adds: Vines on white grain elevators are not approved.

L. Mack: Second.

Larsen: I think that's all ... sorry, I was kind of going through there but, you jumped the gun a little bit but I think everything else is meant to stay the same. So we have a second from Commissioner Mack, Linda Mack. Discussion on the motion? Commissioner Haecker.

Haecker: I mean maybe this is all just assumption but should there be some mention of the machine shop? I mean, I think I kind of know what is happening to it, but like the silos, we really don't and I mean, obviously, this is just about the site plan and the corridor, but if we are improving the site plan, but right now, well, right now includes all the properties. Just, I think it deserves mentioning.

Larsen: Sure, ok, I'll take that as a friendly amendment and I will suggest then that the language include from "public access, hydrological resources, resource interpretation, maintenance, and maintenance of white grain elevators and the machine shop."

Lackovic: Actually, Chad, can I make a friendly amendment to the friendly amendment and suggest that we take the white grain elevators and the machine shop out of #1 and make it a separate issue? It's a very different, a very different ...

Haecker: That is acceptable to the first friendly amender.

Lackovic: That is an amendment to an amendment, but the treatment of those and a preservation plan for those two is very different than a coordinated site plan.

Larsen: So are you suggesting then that the extra point would be more to the white grain elevators and the machine shop to be maintained consistent with something?

Lackovic: (unclear)

Larsen: Those are addressed in another section.

Lackovic: (unclear) ... but like those I would make that a separate point and include the white grain elevators (unclear).

Larsen: So are you looking for a maintenance plan? Maintenance and reuse plan?

Lackovic: I don't think it needs to be a reuse plan, I think it just needs to be a preservation plan and they can tell us whatever they want.

L. Mack: I think it is premature to ask for a reuse plan before we issue a building permit for the whole rest of it because they are separate from this development proposal.

Lackovic: A preservation plan ... (unclear).

Larsen: Ok, hang on a moment please. Is that something that you want to see, or are suggesting we see here, along with effectively kind of concurrently with the site plan? Ok. Alright. So I will modify Item #1 to strike "maintenance of white grain elevators so that everything else stays there ... I didn't add the machine shop, so that is never approved ... so then we will add a condition, #14, that a Preservation Plan to be submitted for the white grain elevators and the machine shop. This plan is to be reviewed by the HPC in a public hearing." Is that acceptable to the seconder?

L. Mack: Yes.

Larsen: Alright, further discussion on the motion? Seeing no further discussion, we'll call the roll.

Ayes: Hunter Weir, Haecker, L. Mack, Lindberg, Tableporter, Larsen, Kelley, and Lackovic

Nays: None

Recused: R. Mack

Absent: Faucher

Motion Carried